

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
Washington, D.C.

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
APRIL 9, 2010 IN THE STATE ROOM**

**Present:** President Knapp, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman, Associate Registrar Andersen, and Parliamentarian Charnovitz; Deans Phillips and Reum; Professors Barnhill, Benton-Short, Boyce, Biles, Cordes, Corry, Dickson, Galston, Garcia, Garris, Green, Griffith, Harrington, Helgert, Hotez, Klaren, Lipscomb, Pagel, Parsons, Rehman, Robinson, Simon, Windsor, and Wirtz

**Absent:** Deans Barratt, Brown, Burke, Dolling, Futrell, Lawrence, and Scott; Professors Costanza, Johnson, Plack, and Wilmarth

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by President Knapp at 2:15 p.m.

**SHORT RECESS FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING A GROUP PHOTOGRAPH  
TAKEN OF THE 2009-10 FACULTY SENATE**

A short adjournment was declared in order to have the annual photograph of the Senate taken.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 12, 2010 were approved as distributed.

**INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS**

President Knapp requested and received unanimous consent to read a Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Robinson, whose term as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee would be finished on April 30. Following his reading of the Resolution, Professor Robinson expressed her appreciation for the generous words and the kind sentiments expressed in the Resolution. She added that she was honored to have had the opportunity to participate in the work of the Faculty Senate and in advancing and achieving the University's mission. (Resolution 09/4 was adopted and is enclosed.)

President Knapp noted that this was the last Senate meeting for Professor Griffith, a long-serving member of the Senate. He said he had enjoyed working with Professor Griffith and wished him the best in the future.

Both of these expressions of appreciation were greeted with a round of applause from the Senate.

**RESOLUTION 09/5 "A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING"**

As specified in Senate rules concerning consideration of a Resolution not circulated with the meeting agenda, motion was made and seconded, and a vote was taken, to consider Resolution 09/5. The motion to introduce Resolution 09/5 was approved. [Note: the term "Faculty Senate" (or "Senate") in these minutes is the entity to which the University's *Faculty Code* and *Faculty Organization Plan* refer. The term "Medical Faculty Senate" is used where the reference pertains to the Faculty Senate of the Medical Center.]

Professor Biles, a member of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing formed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, presented the Resolution. He reviewed each clause, beginning with the first Whereas Clause, which explains that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was not given an opportunity to discuss the possible formation of a School of Nursing before its meeting on February 26, approximately five weeks ago.

The second Whereas Clause of Resolution 09/5 refers to provisions in the *Faculty Code* which recognize the importance of the creation of a new school and explicitly provides that the Faculty Senate [which is comprised of elected representatives of eight of the degree-granting schools of the University] is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations concerning the formation of new schools.

The third Whereas Clause of Resolution 09/5 indicates that the Faculty Senate cannot perform an effective and responsible role in University decision-making unless information necessary for the development of sound, well-informed recommendations has been made available to it by administrative officers of the University. Further, information provided to the Faculty Senate concerning the proposed School of Nursing has not thus far included sufficient supporting information to enable the Senate to perform its Code-mandated function.

Professor Biles went on to review the three Resolving Clauses of Resolution 09/5 which provide:

1. That, the Faculty Senate has not been provided sufficient information to enable the Senate to fulfill its responsibility under Article IX of the *Faculty Code* to evaluate the future prospects for the proposed School of Nursing and to develop sound, well-informed recommendations regarding the potential advantages, disadvantages, benefits and risks of the proposed School of Nursing.
2. That, a comprehensive strategic and financial plan for the formation and implementation of the proposed School of Nursing, as described in the report of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing attached to this Resolution as Appendix A, should be prepared and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate as soon as is feasible.
3. That, no further action should be taken regarding any approval for the establishment of the proposed School of Nursing at the George Washington University unless a comprehensive strategic and financial plan has been

developed and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate at least 60 days in advance of any potential action by the Board of Trustees dealing with approval of the proposed School of Nursing, so that the Senate will have a reasonable opportunity to consider the comprehensive plan and provide sound, well-informed recommendations to the Administration and the Board of Trustees before any such action is taken.

Following his remarks, Professor Biles moved adoption of Resolution 09/5 and the motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Professor Griffith inquired about the timetable for consideration of the Nursing School Proposal by the Board of Trustees. Professor Robinson said her understanding is that the Board intends to act on the proposal at its meetings in May, 2010. She added that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board was given a proposal concerning establishment of the school at its meeting in February 2010, and that the Senate Executive Committee's initial discussion with Senior Associate Dean for Health Sciences Jean Johnson did not occur until two weeks later.

Professor Biles requested and received the privilege of the floor for Professor Edward Cherian, Chair of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, and for Dr. Jean Johnson. Professor Cherian advised that the Special Committee had reviewed the briefing charts presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee February 26 that outlined the need for a School of Nursing, but did not provide detailed information about the proposed school. The Special Committee believes that it is critical to develop a detailed strategic plan before the University undertakes the major commitment to create a new school. The Special Committee prepared the report contained in the Appendix to Resolution 09/5 and outlined the elements and information that should be provided in a strategic plan for the school.

Professor Cordes asked if the proposed school would be an independent, degree-granting school, or a school within a school, such as the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy or the School of Media and Public Affairs. Professor Cherian said he understood the Nursing School would be an independent, free-standing school.

Professor Garris observed that the process is moving forward very fast, and inquired about the major reason for establishment of a separate school. Professor Cherian said that apparently the nursing department is very strong, and that is the basis for it to become a separate school.

Professor Barnhill asked if someone could give the Senate an idea about the number of students majoring in nursing and how that compares to the administrative overhead that would be associated with the school. He also asked if it were anticipated that the proposed School of Nursing would be housed in a facility of its own. President Knapp said he thought it was a good idea to ask for preliminary answers to these sorts of questions, but he urged that the Senate focus on the Resolution, which raises a different issue than the substantive question of whether or not to establish a Nursing School.

Dr. Johnson explained that there currently is a Department of Nursing, which offers Master's degrees with several tracks, a Doctor of Nursing Practice program and a second degree Bachelor of Science Program. There are currently about 350 students. GW's nursing program is dually located at Foggy Bottom and the Virginia Science and Technology Campus. The Bachelor's program at the Virginia Campus was approved in April 2009, and

commenced in Fall, 2009 with 20 students. The program now has over 400 applications for 50 positions, and has excellent partners in Virginia who hire nurses and are looking forward to the nursing program's expansion. Last fall, a School Formation Committee was constituted, and Professor Simon was a member of that Committee. It recommended the initiation of a Nursing School because it was seen as an area for which demand is strong and increasing. There is also the opportunity to expand research and create an endowment for the School, which would not be possible at the departmental level. After the School Formation Committee completed its work, a Resolution was submitted to the Executive Committee of the Medical Faculty Senate which approved it, and on to the full Medical Faculty Senate, which also approved it. Once that process was complete, Dr. Johnson said, a discussion about the proposed Nursing School took place on February 26, 2010 with the [University] Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Dean Johnson confirmed Professor Cherian's assertion that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee did not receive a proposal for the School's formation, but rather was provided with a briefing paper. She added that she was well aware that a full proposal needed to be prepared and presented to the Board of Trustees, and that this would need to be complete by April 21, 2010. However, neither the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or the Faculty Senate indicated that a proposal would be requested, nor was a timetable for the receipt of this information provided. She added that when she met with the Senate Executive Committee February 26, she anticipated a collegial, problem-solving activity, and although she appreciated her contacts with Professor Cherian, up to this point had yet to meet with the Special Committee itself.

Professor Wirtz spoke in support of the Resolution, saying he thought if there is a rush to judgment in establishing this new school, a repeat of the Faculty Senate's experience with the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS) was likely to result. After 13 years, the SPHHS remains non-compliant with the *Faculty Code* in key ways. If a Nursing School is to be established, it should be done right, not rushed. The only thing that Resolution 09/5 does is to formalize the process that the Senate Executive Committee established to make sure that problems experienced with the SPHHS would not be repeated.

Professor Corry asked what consequences would occur if the decision to establish a Nursing School is delayed by six months to a year. Dr. Johnson responded that the major disadvantage has to do with the ability to recruit new faculty – it is difficult to attract tenured faculty (who are most likely to be research-intensive) to a Department, as opposed to a School of Nursing. The ability to establish an endowment or raise funds for the School would also be delayed.

Discussion followed. In response to a question about the general structure of the information requested in Resolution 09/5, Dr. Johnson responded that nearly all of the information requested in the Appendix to Resolution 09/5 has already been developed and provided to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, which approves new programs.

Professor Griffith spoke in support of Resolution 09/5. He said he was a member of the Committee which studied the formation of the SPHHS, and that was a very frustrating experience because the Committee was not given adequate information and its deliberations were rushed along. Items identified by the Committee as potential problems



were largely ignored. He agreed with Professor Wirtz that the Faculty Senate should have the time to perform its task correctly and added that he hoped Dr. Johnson would be able to provide the requested material in very short order.

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman said he thought it is very important to realize that in order to obtain approval for programs by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, essentially all of the information requested in Resolution 09/5 must be provided. The Academic Affairs Committee will not even consider proposals that do not contain this information, and Vice President Lehman said he would not allow a proposal to go forward with incomplete information. Vice President Lehman urged that the Senate think about a School that was successfully put into place, i.e., the College of Professional Studies. Formation of the CPS was studied by a group of people appointed by the administration and faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate, and this group worked together to produce the report that was considered by the Faculty Senate. Vice President Lehman urged that the Special Committee, or possibly even an expanded Special Committee, meet and work directly with Dr. Johnson, and complete its work rapidly. There is a critical need in the state of Virginia for nurses, and formation of the Nursing School is an important part of the evolution of medical programs at the University. The prudent thing to do is for everyone to collaborate and move deliberations to the end point.

Professor Biles asked Professor Cherian to comment, since as Chair of the Special Committee, he has been working with Dr. Johnson to acquire information. Professor Biles said his impression is that the information outlined in the Appendix to Resolution 09/5 is apparently not available at this point. Professor Cherian said he had met with Dr. Johnson twice in the past ten days, and had inquired about these items. He said he was told Dr. Johnson had most of the material, however, he did not as yet have it. Professor Cherian said he endorsed Vice President Lehman's encouragement of a spirit of cooperation, and in fact that spirit is there. He also said he personally supported the establishment of a School of Nursing, but the proper process for doing this needs to be followed. Professor Cherian said he would do whatever is required to help Dr. Johnson pull together the necessary information. He also said that he had already suggested the names of several people in the School of Business who are experienced in writing strategic plans, developing market research studies or otherwise might be helpful to Dr. Johnson in collecting data.

Professor Simon noted that the *Faculty Code* requires that the Faculty Senate and its Executive Committee must be provided information concerning the formation of new schools, however, the only approval that is required is at the Board of Trustees level. President Knapp concurred with this observation, saying that what the Senate has the power to do is to make recommendations to the Board. As a member of the School Formation Committee, Professor Simon said he recalled seeing some of the information requested by the Special Committee, including an economic plan and information on the new school's endowment. He added he did not see why the information should not be available.

Dr. Johnson said she appreciated the opportunity to meet with Professor Cherian twice thus far. She said the first meeting was to advise her that the Special Committee had met and outlined some of the Committee's expectations. What has not been clear to her, she added, is who needed to receive the information first. She said she was aware that a full proposal-- not different pieces of the proposal given to different people at different times -- for the Board of Trustees was due in the office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs by April 21. She said the first she had heard about a specific time frame was when

she read Resolution 09/5 at their second meeting. Dr. Johnson said what she would view as collaboration would be for the Special Committee to meet with herself and other members of the Department of Nursing Education so that issues of everyone's concern could be identified and a way could be found to resolve these. She said she thought this was what Vice President Lehman was talking about when he brought up the formation process for the CPS, and that is what she would like to see happen with respect to the School of Nursing.

Discussion followed. It was established that the Board of Trustees Committee on Academic Affairs would meet on May 13 and the full Board would meet the following day, on May 14. Dr. Johnson said that she could make the final Nursing School proposal available to the Senate on Tuesday, April 13. Further discussion followed on the issue of whether or not the 60 day timetable in Resolution 09/5 could be revised downward. Professor Biles asked Professor Cherian how long he thought it would take to review the proposal. Professor Cherian responded that if what he called the plan, or others termed the proposal, was available on April 13, it might take a week or two to look at it, and then the Committee's recommendations would have to be transmitted to the Senate Executive Committee. As to whether or not the whole task could be completed by May 13<sup>th</sup>, he was uncertain. Vice President Lehman said he thought it might be possible for the Senate to schedule a special meeting before May 13<sup>th</sup> to consider the issue.

Professor Cherian pointed out that before any collaboration or further work takes place, there must be a document to discuss, and at present there is no document on the table.

Professor Robinson said one of the problems is that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was drawn into this process quite late. There may have been a misconception that by obtaining approvals from the Medical Center Faculty Senate, the process of consultation was complete. The present situation was not of the Faculty Senate's making. She added that Vice President Lehman was quite right – formation of the CPS was something that the administration and Senate worked on very successfully, but the difference was that there was a great deal of time. She said it seemed to her the discussions lasted at least a year. That situation is quite different than the problem before the Senate now. She said she did not think the Special Committee needed to be expanded, as suggested by the Vice President, but she agreed with Professor Cherian that the immediate need is a document with which to work. As to a special Senate meeting, the Senate Executive Committee meets next on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, and that means a Resolution about the Nursing School should be received by then. A special meeting of the Senate could be scheduled if the Special Committee has completed its work.

Professor Wirtz said he thought the Senate discussion was headed in the right direction, however, it was not clear that all of the issues involved can be resolved in 30 days, or even in 60. In particular, item 8 of the Appendix to Resolution 09/5, which calls for a detailed plan for the separation of the Nursing Department from the Health Sciences Programs and other Medical School ties, is important. Related questions include what the role of the Medical Faculty Senate is in the formation of a school, and to what extent the Nursing School will be protected from the political nuances involved in the Medical School Faculty Senate. He said his sense of the situation is that a number of thorny issues are involved, and as appreciative as he was of the need to move ahead, he did not want to see the Senate replicate the errors that occurred in the formation of the SPHHS. He concluded

with the observation that, while everyone is on the same wavelength in terms of collaboration, the process should not be rushed for the sake of a speedy conclusion.

Professor Griffith asked what would happen if the proposal is not considered at the Board of Trustees' meetings in May. Vice President Lehman said that it might be possible to present it at the June Board retreat, if the Board were willing to conduct a regular meeting then. Professor Griffith spoke in favor of the Resolution, as he was entirely in sympathy with Professor Wirtz's remarks. He added that it seemed to him the process was on a fast train that was headed downhill. The issues surrounding the formation of a new Nursing School are not going to be easily or quickly resolvable and if too tight a time schedule is agreed upon, then the pressure will be to meet the schedule rather than solve the problems. The result may well be unsatisfactory. The Senate definitely needs to take the time necessary to allow proper vetting of the proposal.

President Knapp said he was not aware that the proposal has any bearing on the structure of the Medical Center other than whether to have a third school within the Medical Center, namely the School of Nursing. There is no proposal to break up the Medical Center or its Senate, to eliminate the position of the Vice President for Health Affairs, or anything of that kind. Professor Wirtz responded that there is a mechanism in place now where the various units of the Medical Center report to the Vice President for Health Affairs with regard to certain parts of what they do. Other Schools of the University report directly to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Another question is the extent to which the structure proposed for the Nursing School would in fact be independent of the kinds of problems that have arisen in connection with other schools within the Medical Center. One of these questions is the extent to which schools in the Medical Center should be exempt from certain provisions of the *Faculty Code*. Professor Simon said he recognized that there is still a problem with the footnote on page 18 of the *Code*. It needs to be corrected to make a distinction between clinical and non-clinical faculty. Assuming that Dr. Johnson presents the proposal by April 13, any problems with it can be discussed, but he added that he did not know what problems might arise until the proposal was made available.

Discussion followed about the timeline contained in Resolution 09/5 for receipt of the Nursing School proposal. Professor Cherian said if he were asked if 30 days would be sufficient to review the proposal, his judgment would be it was unlikely, as a proposal addressing all of the pertinent issues would likely be over 100 pages in length. Professor Robinson reiterated the possibility that it might be necessary for the Board to look at the proposal in June at their retreat. She added that she hoped the process could be completed before then, but absent a proposal, no one knows.

Professor Galston offered a friendly amendment to amend the phrase in the third Resolving Clause of Resolution from "at least 60 days" to "at least 30 days." Discussion followed. Professor Barnhill asked whether or not enough time was being allowed for the Special Committee and the Senate to read and understand the proposal and the Special Committee's conclusions about it. He also asked if Vice President Lehman could provide a comparative analysis of the student, faculty, and administrative costs for other schools at the University for comparison with the Nursing School proposal. Vice President Lehman responded that this information is obtainable and that he would make it available, although he was uncertain about the level of detail that could be provided. Following further discussion, Professor Galston's friendly amendment was not accepted by Professor Biles. Professor Simon said he would accept the altered timeline and moved the language offered

by Professor Galston. The motion to amend was seconded. A vote was taken, and the amendment was adopted.

Following further discussion, a vote was taken on Resolution 09/5. Resolution 09/5 as amended, was adopted. (Resolution 09/5 is attached.)

#### UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Professor Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee (FP&B), presented the update as a Powerpoint report, which is enclosed.

Professor Cordes first commented on the information in the update pertaining to budget projections and second quarter financial results. In summary, projections at this point indicate that both revenues and expenses (above the line items) are somewhat higher than forecast. Gross tuition revenue will be higher than projected, approximately \$17 million, because there are 200 more freshmen than anticipated. However, additional expenditures for financial aid – some \$11.5 million will be required to support these additional students, many of whom demonstrated financial need.

On the expense side of the budget in the area of compensation, the update indicates a net increase of \$3 million. This was due to \$4.3 million in turnover costs budgeted for that did not materialize and \$2.6 million in other salary and wage costs, offset by \$4 million in fringe benefits savings. The University has incurred additional expenses for purchased services, including regulatory and compliance costs and continuing amounts for the development of a unified web presence. The University has done better than projected in its collection of bad debt.

Professor Cordes described the below the line components of the projected budget. These include debt service and mandatory purposes, endowment support, capital expenditures, and support/investment. For many years, the below the line number was a negative one, indicating that money was flowing into University reserves from the above the line items. That number is now positive, indicating that that the University is drawing from its reserves to meet certain needs. The original projection for this year was a drawdown on reserves of approximately \$10 million, but because other results are more favorable than anticipated, the drawdown may be less.

Professor Cordes reviewed information in the update concerning the University's endowment. Roughly the same amount is taken each year from the endowment for various purposes. Thus, in some years the percentage of the endowment market value paid out will be less than 5%, and in others such as this year, more than 5%. That figure includes the payout from Square 54 as well as supplemental payouts that have been coming from the endowment for the last couple of years for the Strategic Plan for Academic Excellence.

Professor Cordes briefly reviewed information issued by two bond rating agencies in March when the University borrowed \$200 million. (This information is enclosed.) Generally, both agencies are pleased with the overall financial circumstances of the University, particularly the above the line operating surplus, and liquid reserves of approximately \$270 million. One negative mentioned in the rating reports – the Medical School's accreditation difficulties – has been resolved. The agencies also recognize the importance of enrollments to the University's overall financial picture.



Professor Cordes commented on the Budget Working Group on which members of the FP&B Committee, Deans, and members appointed by the Senate and the Administration serve. The group meets at least once a year to discuss budget development. Mindful of the cap on enrollment at the Foggy Bottom campus, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Treasurer is exploring ways to address this, including approaching various campus entities in order to gauge their willingness to move. Last year the University was within 70 FTE enrollments of the cap. This year, it appears that the University is approximately 200 FTE enrollments under the cap, and this will provide a little more room to maneuver if the admissions yield this year is better than expected.

Professor Cordes also reported that the Board of Trustees has been committed to maintaining a merit pool increase for faculty and staff. It was mentioned to the Budget Working Group that the Board is considering a merit pool going forward of 3% rather than 4%. While this seems a small reduction, there are consequences going forward if the baseline rate is changed. Generally such decisions are not made on a year-by-year basis; nor are tuition increase rates. With the effect of compounding over a period of time, the effects on the expense side of the University budget would begin to be evident, and about four years from now, the expense budget would basically be lowered by about \$12 million. Professor Cordes showed an example of what this means for salaries, roughly speaking. About four years from now, an individual's baseline salary would be roughly a couple of thousand dollars less under a 3% merit pool than one allowing 4%. Professor Cordes said he hoped the Board would stay the course with the higher figure, dependent, of course, upon enrollments and other key factors, particularly because last year it was clear that the University had some catching up to do in comparison with its market basket schools. [Following the meeting, Professor Cordes supplied a correction where two lines of text were transposed on slide 12 (page 32 of the minutes). This slide provides information on merit pool percentages. The correct information has been substituted in the Budget Update posted to the Senate website and will be retained in the permanent records of the Senate Office.]

Professor Cordes touched briefly on the Innovation Task Force -- a group of faculty and staff that has been tasked with the mission of trying to identify either new sources of revenue or achieve savings in the University's operations. The goal over the next five years is to produce the financial equivalent of \$60 million per year which could be earmarked for the improvement of academic programs at the University. The Task Force is led by a Steering Committee (headed by Associate Vice President Lenn) and two working groups, one on learning processes and another on business processes. While the Task Force will not hold the town hall meetings originally envisioned, it will provide other ways for faculty, staff, and students to provide input concerning the proposals selected by the Task Force. The Task Force has already identified \$2.8 million in conserved resources. One early result is that savings identified by the Task Force have been provided to the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences to improve its academic advising. A notional account showing the sources of savings achieved and the uses for those funds will be established and featured on the Task Force's website.

Professor Cordes concluded his report by commenting briefly on the proposed Science and Engineering Complex. He characterized the 2008 estimate of the possible cost of the project (included in the update) as illustrative. The project will ideally have funding

sources that will leave the operating budget unaffected, in other words, be budget neutral. These sources would be the three-legged stool described by President Knapp – revenue from Square 54, increased indirect cost recoveries from research, and philanthropy. As the benchmarking and programming phase of the project has just been concluded, a cost estimate for the project has not yet been developed. This cost estimate will have to account for lost parking facilities once the University Garage is demolished. There are 1200 spaces in that facility, and the cost of replacing from 800 to 900 spaces will need to be taken into account, as the SEC will not be able to accommodate more than 300 to 400 spaces. Proponents of the SEC point to significant benefits, however, the SEC still poses budgetary challenges.

Professor Hotez inquired about the revenue stream from the Square 54 lease, as he originally had heard estimates of \$9 to \$10 million per year, and the amount projected in Professor Cordes' update is substantially less. Professor Cordes confirmed that the annual amount of the ground lease is \$9 to \$10 million per year. However, the decision was made to capitalize the asset value of the lease payments and add that amount to the University's endowment. The standard formula for payouts from the endowment, applied to this capitalized figure, would yield approximately \$7 million per year beginning in FY10. [According to footnote 5 in the endowment budget support information provided about the Square 54 item in the update, "the payout for FY08 and FY09 [\$4.5 and \$5.8 million respectively] are amounts representative of site development costs. \$3.3 million in ground rent distributions in excess of estimated development costs was reinvested in the endowment. Beginning in FY10 the payout from ground rent distributions will be based on the University's current payout policy. Consistent with that policy, payout will also be distributed from prior year reinvestments. Any ground rent not distributed as payout will be reinvested. An estimated \$2 million will be reinvested in FY10."]

Professor Barnhill asked what information Professor Cordes could supply on University projections regarding likely increases to the endowment related to this project. Professor Cordes responded that he did not have that information. President Knapp confirmed that Professor Barnhill's query was about fundraising and not about the endowment *per se*. A planning process is underway concerning many aspects of the University's fundraising activities, including the feasibility of fundraising for a wide variety of purposes and/or the overall concept of a comprehensive capital campaign. The reason that cost estimates for the SEC have not been provided to the University community is because those financial numbers do not yet exist.

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON CORE INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Lehman presented the Annual Report, which is enclosed. He began by thanking Joe Knop, Director of Institutional Research, and Annie Wooldridge, Director of Faculty Recruitment and Personnel, for their assistance in pulling together the data and information contained in the Annual Report and in the Biennial Report on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minority Faculty.

Vice President Lehman reviewed the topics covered in the Annual Report, which include faculty composition and trends, teaching loads and student-faculty ratios, class sizes and distributions, faculty salaries, and enrollment information and trends in undergraduate, graduate certificate, Master's, Doctoral, and Law and Medical programs.

Information on faculty composition and trends, as well as a breakdown of information about regular, active-status faculty and non-tenure track (contract) faculty is provided on slides 3 through 13 of the Annual Report. Over the period 1998-2009, the number of regular, active-status faculty has increased by 128 or 19.8%. The Report also shows the percentage of regular, active-status faculty in Columbian College of Arts and Sciences (CCAS), the Elliott School of International Affairs (ESIA), the School of Business (SB), the School of Engineering and Applied Science (SEAS), and the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (GSEHD). This same information is reported for the College of Professional Studies, the GW Law School, the School of Medicine and Health Sciences [including affiliated faculty members of the Medical Faculty Associates, and Children's National Medical Center] and the School of Public Health and Health Services (SPHHS). Information concerning limited service faculty (excluding research, visiting, and affiliated faculty), and separate information on research faculty members is also provided. Conclusions concerning faculty trends are provided on slides 11-13 of the Annual Report. Of note in the information provided is that GSEHD's non-tenure-track to tenure-track ratio in percent has improved, that ratio having been 41.4% in 2004 and, in 2009, 34.7%. SPHHS has a total of 55 regular, active-status faculty, and the largest number (52) of research faculty members of any School. The SMHS ranks second in the number of research faculty members (36), and CCAS ranks third, with 20.

Information concerning teaching loads is provided on slides 15 through 18 of the Annual Report. This section concludes that, on average, across five schools (CCAS, ESIA, GWSB, SEAS, and GSEHD) full-time faculty members (tenure-track and non-tenure track) teach the majority of students (55.3%) and course sections (52%). For information concerning the breakdown of teaching loads by the number of courses and hours taught in these five schools, see slide 15.

Information concerning undergraduate and graduate class sizes and distribution of course sections in the five schools and the College of Professional Studies (CPS) is set forth in slides 20-25 of the Annual Report. While the number of course sections has increased 20.5% from 1998 to 2009, class size has remained relatively stable over that period, except for upper level undergraduate courses, which have increased by 18.7%. GW enrolled its largest freshman classes in 2001, 2004, and 2009 and these enrollments obviously influence the number of courses and sections taught, as well as the number of faculty required to teach them. Despite these fluctuations in class size, GW's student-faculty ratio has remained essentially stationary over the past five years.

Information concerning faculty salaries, including gender and AAUP comparisons for regular, active-status faculty (professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, continuing and new) is provided on slides 27 – 39 of the Annual Report. AAUP information in this section is current as of 2008-09, the latest information available at the time of the April 9, 2010 Faculty Senate meeting. The report observes that, in terms of average salaries, GW is somewhat below the middle of the list of market basket schools, except in the associate professor category, where salaries are just above the middle. Analysis of this data, along with regular salary equity reviews, indicates that the University's gender balance in salaries is appropriate. Another salary equity review will take place in 2010-11.

Information on undergraduate enrollment trends, including data on applicant's ACT and SAT scores, is provided in slides 43-56 of the Annual Report. The Report indicates that of 19,500 applicants, GW accepts approximately 7,300 students (a 37% acceptance rate,

approximately) with a yield of 33-35% to admit a freshman class of approximately 2,400 students.

Information on graduate certificate enrollments in eight of GW's Schools (excluding the Law School) is provided on pages 58-61 of the Annual Report. Enrollments in this segment have increased from 621 in 2005 to 1192 in 2009. The largest growth is in off-campus programs, with enrollments of 1,054. The Virginia Science and Technology (VS&T) campus enrolls fewer than a dozen students in this category.

Information is also provided in the Annual Report about enrollment trends in master's degree programs (slides 63-76), doctoral programs (slides 78 - 91) and professional degree programs (slides 93-98). Over the past five years, enrollment in on-campus master's degree programs has increased approximately 6.9%, to 5,838 students. Over that same period, off-campus enrollments in master's degree programs have increased 27.5% (2,717 students). Master's enrollments at the VS&T campus have declined over that period by 6.2%, with 244 students at present. Enrollments in GW's on-campus doctoral programs have decreased 16% over the past five years, but off-campus enrollments have increased by 26%. These enrollments at the VS&T campus have declined by 11%. In terms of enrollment trends in the Law and Medical professional degree programs, the number of students enrolled in the J.D. and M.D. programs has remained relatively constant, with applications for the J.D. program declining slightly, consistent with a national trend. Applications for other graduate level programs in the SMHS and the SPHHS have increased to 3,418. The Report indicates that part of this growth reflects the creation of doctoral degrees in physical therapy and nursing in the SMHS.

Professor Lipscomb asked if faculty composition data includes special service faculty. Vice President Lehman responded that it does not, only regular, active-status faculty are included. She also asked if the data on students taught, and by whom includes sections that are laboratory sections which are part of another course. Vice President Lehman responded that laboratory sections are counted as separate sections for purposes of the Report. Another question was posed concerning whether or not the data takes into account course relief that department chairs and administrators receive. Vice President Lehman responded that the data reflects what people are actually doing - thus, if a department chair is only teaching one course, the data reflects that. The questioner observed that if there is a lot of administrative work in a particular unit, this would tend to reduce the average number of courses and sections taught per faculty member in that unit. Professor Biles asked if information concerning the nursing programs could be provided. Vice President Lehman responded that this information is embedded in the data presented, and that he could separate it from the other information in the SMHS data.

#### **BIENNIAL REPORT ON THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF WOMEN AND MINORITY FACULTY**

Vice President Lehman presented the Biennial Report. The Report overview indicates that the information presented outlines the status of recruitment, appointment, promotion, tenure, and retention for women faculty and faculty of color at GW from November 1, 2007 through October 31, 2009. Unless otherwise noted, information contained in the Report refers to full-time regular, active-status faculty, including MFA faculty, but does not include Deans or Associate Deans in the faculty count.



Overall, the percentage of female and male faculty members has changed over the past two years. The proportion of female faculty grew by 2% to 39%, and the proportion of male faculty declined by 2% to 61%, numbering 470 and 750 respectively. The Report provides an Executive Summary on page 3, and each entry is substantiated by Tables and Appendices with relevant detail. Due to the lateness of the hour, Vice President Lehman did not delve deeply into the vast amount of information contained in the Biennial Report, but he encouraged Senate members to read the material at their leisure and pose any questions they might have to him after the meeting.

Highlights of the Biennial Report cited by Vice President Lehman include data indicating that in the past two years, 144 new full-time faculty members were added, and of this group, 46% were women and 32.6 were faculty of color. In the junior faculty ranks, GW is approaching a 50-50 hiring balance in the ratio of men to women. The percentage of faculty of color hired is increasing, and Vice President Lehman said he hoped this would continue so that diversity in faculty ranks becomes more similar to the diversity of the student body. Black faculty members at the University now number 58. As a percentage of the total faculty population, this group now represents 5% rather than 4% of the overall faculty numbers at GW. In addition, most additional faculty of color are female.

Additional information contained in the Biennial Report documents ten-year growth trends, comparisons with the student body and faculty populations at market basket and local institutions, and information on faculty retention. This detailed and comprehensive Report is enclosed with the minutes.

Professor Galston asked if the data presented in the Reports is public information, and Vice President Lehman said that it was.

#### GENERAL BUSINESS

##### I. NOMINEES FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE 2010-11 SESSION

Professor Harrington, convener of the Nominating Committee, moved the nomination of Professor Michael S. Castleberry (GSEHD) as Chair of the 2010-11 Executive Committee. The nomination was approved. He then moved the nomination of the following faculty members to the 2010-11 Executive Committee: Professors Brian L. Biles (SPHHS), Miriam Galston (GWLS), Charles A. Garris, Jr. (SEAS), Diana E. Johnson (CCAS), Peter F. Klaren (ESIA), Gary L. Simon (SMHS), and Philip W. Wirtz (SB). The entire slate was approved.

##### II. NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION COMMITTEE

Professor Robinson moved the election of the following faculty members to the Committee: Professor Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS) as Chair for a one-year term (2010-2011 session); Professors Robert E. Cottrol (GWLS), Guillermo Gutierrez (SMHS), Joan E. Schaffner (GWLS), and Michael Selmi (GWLS), for three-year terms. The entire slate was approved.

**III. NOMINATION FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF THE PARLIAMENTARIAN**

Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Steve Charnovitz as Parliamentarian for the 2010-2011 Session. The nomination was approved.

**IV. NOMINATION FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES**

Professor Robinson moved the nominations of the following faculty members to Administrative Committees: Committee on the Judicial System: Michael S. Castleberry and Bruno Petinaux; University Hearing Board: Ozgur Ekmekci and Margaret M. Plack; Marvin Center Program Board: Carmen F. Gomez; Marvin Center Governing Board: Jacqueline S. Barnett, Frederic Lemieux, and T.N. Lee. The nominations were approved.

**IV. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Professor Robinson presented the Report of the Executive Committee, which is enclosed.

**V. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES**

No annual reports were received.

**CHAIR'S REMARKS**

Vice President Lehman thanked members of the Senate for their work during the session. He also thanked Professor Robinson for her service to the Senate.

**BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)**

Professor Biles said he thought the Senate should thank Vice President Lehman for all of his work this year as well as in previous years. There followed a round of applause for which Vice President Lehman expressed his appreciation.

Professor Griffith agreed with Professor Robinson that the Senate owes a great debt of gratitude to members of the Dispute Resolution Committee and faculty members who mediate grievances. The result has been a very successful grievance system. Professor Griffith also commended Parliamentarian Charnovitz, who devotes a good deal of time to Senate matters, adding that this is a service the Senate should recognize.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Senate, and upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION (09/4)**

**WHEREAS, Lilien F. Robinson, Professor of Art History, has earned the highest level of respect, gratitude, appreciation, and admiration from the University community; and**

**WHEREAS, Professor Robinson has completed 31 years of service on the Faculty Senate and is currently finishing her term as Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate; NOW, THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**That the following citation be issued:**

**In recognition of the extraordinary service and outstanding contributions to The George Washington University provided by Professor Lilien F. Robinson, for which she has received numerous accolades, including the George Washington Award, the Trachtenberg Prize for University Service, and the Columbian College Teaching Excellence Award; and**

**In recognition of her 45 years of exemplary service to students and colleagues as a member of the full-time faculty of the Department of Fine Arts and Art History, during which time she has achieved the highest standards of excellence in her teaching and scholarship – including her selection as Co-Editor in Chief for *Serbian Studies* (the peer-reviewed journal of the North American Society for Serbian Studies), her publication of more than thirty scholarly works, including journal articles and exhibition catalogues, and her presentation of more than forty conference papers and public lectures; and**

**In recognition of her 22 years of distinguished service as Chair of the Department of Fine Arts and Art History, during which time she provided exceptional leadership to her Departmental colleagues; and**

**Especially in recognition of her extraordinary contributions to the entire University faculty through her 31 years of remarkable service as a member of the Faculty Senate – including 17 years as a member of the Executive Committee, 15 years as Chair of the Executive Committee, six years as Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, three years as Chair of the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty, three years as Chair of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, and one year as Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy – during which time she has compiled an unparalleled record of major accomplishments for the University faculty, due to her outstanding qualities of leadership, integrity, collegiality, diplomacy, fairness, kindness, patience, and unwavering commitment to reasoned discourse and deliberation and the preservation of shared University governance;**

**THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**HEREBY EXPRESSES ITS DEEPEST APPRECIATION AND PROFOUND GRATITUDE TO**

**PROFESSOR LILIEN F. ROBINSON**

**FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE**

**Steven Knapp**

**Steven Knapp  
President**

**/SEAL/**

**Adopted April 9, 2010**

## **A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING (09/5)**

**WHEREAS**, a proposal to establish a new School of Nursing was presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on February 26, 2010.

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.A of the *Faculty Code* provides that:

“The Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of schools or other major components of the University.”

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.B of the *Faculty Code* further provides that:

“The faculty cannot perform an effective and responsible role in University decision making without the cooperation of the administrative officers of the University.

“This cooperation includes the provision of such information as is necessary to the development of sound, well-informed recommendations.

“Faculty bodies charged with responsibilities for particular policy and planning areas are entitled, to the extent feasible, to be informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions within their areas of competence to be able to provide their advice or recommendations to the appropriate University officials.”

**WHEREAS**, the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing, as presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, does not include sufficient supporting information to enable the Faculty Senate to evaluate the future prospects of the proposed School or to develop sound, well-informed recommendations concerning the potential advantages, disadvantages, benefits and risks of the proposed School.

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing (“Special Committee”) was appointed by the Executive Committee to review the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing and the Special Committee has submitted a report (a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Appendix A) that describes the Special Committee's evaluation of the proposal and presents the Special Committee's recommendations for further action; **NOW, THEREFORE**

### **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

1. That, the Faculty Senate has not been provided sufficient information to enable the Senate to fulfill its responsibility under Article IX of the Faculty Code to evaluate the future prospects for the proposed School of Nursing and to develop sound, well-informed recommendations regarding the potential advantages, disadvantages, benefits and risks of the proposed School of Nursing.



2. That, a comprehensive strategic and financial plan for the formation and implementation of the proposed School of Nursing, as described in the report of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing attached to this Resolution as Appendix A, should be prepared and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate as soon as is feasible.
3. That, no further action should be taken regarding any approval for the establishment of the proposed School of Nursing at the George Washington University unless a comprehensive strategic and financial plan has been developed and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate at least ~~60~~ 30 days in advance of any potential action by the Board of Trustees dealing with approval of the proposed School of Nursing, so that the Senate will have a reasonable opportunity to consider the comprehensive plan and provide sound, well-informed recommendations to the Administration and the Board of Trustees before any such action is taken.

Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing

Professor Edward J. Cherian, Chair  
Professor Brian L. Biles  
Professor Gary L. Simon  
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.

Adopted, as amended, April 9, 2010

Need for a  
Strategic Plan  
for the  
Formation of a School of Nursing  
at the  
George Washington University

On February 26, 2010 Jean Johnson, Senior Associate Dean of Health Sciences Programs, presented School Formation Committee Recommendations for the establishment of a School of Nursing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. To address this matter, the Executive Committee formed a Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing consisting of the following members: Brian Biles, Edward Cherian (Chair), Gary Simon and Arthur Wilmarth.

The Special Committee has reviewed the materials provided to the Executive Committee and understands the need for a swift and decisive response to this proposal based on the projected timeline of events planned.

One important issue requiring initial agreement is the location of the proposed school. Based on the DC Zoning Board's student, faculty and total population limitations, the only feasible location for this new school – in its entirety - will be at the GW Virginia Science and Technology Center in Ashburn, Virginia. (The DC maximum FTE BZA order limits GW to 16,553 students, staff and faculty at Foggy Bottom. Last fall we had 16,473.) Quality space is available at the STC which can be customized to meet the School's needs. The proximity to a good hospital (INOVA Fairfax and INOVA Loudoun Hospital, Lansdowne, VA) further enhances the attraction of this location.

In order for the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate to review the proposed school of nursing, a comprehensive strategic plan for the formation and implementation of the school is required. Enclosed is a list of information, description of concepts and plans and other requirements (although perhaps incomplete) which must be contained in such a plan in order for the Faculty Senate to be able to make a credible analysis and recommendation about the formation of the proposed school.

- 1) Overall Vision: What is the overall long-range goal for the school? Plans for the formation of a Board of Advisors; fund raising for an endowment; national recognition; future accreditation plans for the School. How will the School function as an independent unit reporting to the Provost?
- 2) Market Data: Who are the students to be recruited, the competition, and how the school will compare to the competition. Market research on the need for nurses, both nationally and regionally should be conducted if current data are not available.
- 3) Marketing Plan: Describe the degrees and courses both existing currently and planned. What are the students and faculty recruitment plans? What are the projected enrollments for students and faculty lines? How do we attract "the best"?
- 4) Implementation Plan: a) Who will be the senior executives in the operation of this school? What are their qualifications? Who else is needed? Clear description of the position descriptions for each of the different faculty and staff categories. B) APT criteria and process for each faculty category. How will the School satisfy the 75/25% tenure/tenure track requirement? Overall Plan for Faculty Code compliance. Search committee formation criteria and composition for new faculty searches.
- 5) Organization charts indicating current and future appointments. Proposed by-laws for the School and Programs/Departments consistent with the Faculty Code. Description and plans for acquisition for the physical facilities and equipments required.
- 6) Critical Risks and Strengths: What are the risks that may cause this school to be unsuccessful? What is the strategy and plans for success and growth?
- 7) Financial Plan: A pro forma income/expense statement for five years with the first year in considerable detail. What is the source of required funding? Projections of tuition revenue, research support, donations and cash flow needs. Cost of initial formation (start-up expenses) including proposed use of consultants and special

services. Will the School be self-sustaining from the initial year of operation? If not what will be the sources of subsidies? Planned tuition and other charges, and availability of scholarships/discount rate.

- 8) Detailed plan for the separation of the Nursing Department from the Health Sciences Programs and other Medical Center ties: Equitable division of research contracts, assets, faculty and staff. What will be the remaining relationships with the Health Sciences Programs and School of Medicine after formation of the new School of Nursing?



## **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**April 9, 2010**

Lilien F. Robinson, Chair

On behalf of the Executive Committee I have the following report.

### **ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

#### ***Proposed School of Nursing***

The Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing, chaired by Professor Edward Cherian, has met with Senior Associate Dean for Health Sciences Jean Johnson. Pursuant to their discussions and the Executive Committee's charge, the Special Committee prepared the resolution and accompanying commentary presented at today's meeting of the Faculty Senate.

#### ***Faculty Handbook***

The *Faculty Handbook* is in its final stages of revision before it is made available electronically to the University community. The Executive Committee has requested that Professor Murli Gupta participate in the final stage of this process to provide faculty input. He has agreed to undertake this assignment.

#### ***Gender Neutral Housing***

Associate Vice President for Student and Academic Support Services Peter Konwerski recently requested that the Executive Committee appoint a Senate representative to serve on the panel exploring whether or not the University should provide gender neutral housing. Professor Alan Wade, Faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, has indicated his willingness to serve.

### **PERSONNEL MATTERS**

The one remaining grievance originating in the Elliott School of International Affairs has been settled through mediation.

The Executive Committee is most appreciative of the efforts of Professor Paul Swiercz in conducting the successful mediation in this case. The University is most fortunate to have faculty members willing to provide their expertise and time to the resolution of disputes through our internal grievance process. We have been extremely successful in this respect and thanks are due to the members of the Dispute Resolution Committee and the exemplary leadership of Professor Kurt Darr, the Committee Chair.

## **OTHER MATTERS**

### ***Annual Reports of Faculty Senate Committees***

Please note that annual reports of Faculty Senate Committees are due. Chairs who have not yet submitted their reports should do so by the May meeting.

### ***May Senate Meeting***

Because of scheduling issues surrounding Commencement activities, the Faculty Senate meeting on May 14, 2010 will begin at 1 p.m. rather than the usual time of 2:10. Please mark your calendars.

### ***Executive Committee Meeting***

The Executive Committee for the 2009-2010 session and the Executive Committee for the 2010-2011 session will meet together on April 23<sup>rd</sup> to nominate Chairs and members of the Senate Standing Committees and set the agenda for the May 14<sup>th</sup> Faculty Senate meeting.

Resolutions, reports, and any other matters should be submitted to the Executive Committee prior to its April 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**  
**Washington, D.C.**

**The Faculty Senate**

**April 1, 2010**

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 9, 2010 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room,  
1957 E Street, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order
2. Short recess for the purpose of having a group photograph taken of the 2009-10 Faculty Senate
3. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of March 12, 2010 (minutes to be distributed)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Update on the University Budget: Professor Joseph Cordes, Chair Fiscal Planning & Budgeting Committee
6. Annual Report on Core Indicators of Academic Excellence  
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald Lehman
7. Biennial Report on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minority Faculty  
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Donald Lehman
8. General Business:
  - a) Nominations for election of members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the 2010-11 Session (nominees to be announced)
  - b) Nominations for election of five faculty members (for a three-year term, replacing those whose terms expire May 1, 2010) and Chair (for a one-year term) to the Dispute Resolution Committee: Professor Kurt J. Darr (SPHHS) as Chair for the 2010-11 Session; Professor Joan E. Schaffner (GWLS) as a member of the Committee for a three-year term (other nominees to be announced)
  - c) Nomination for re-appointment by the President of Professor Steve Charnovitz as Parliamentarian for the 2010-11 Session



- d) **Nomination for appointment of faculty members to Administrative Committees: Committee on the Judicial System: Michael S. Castleberry and Bruno Petinaux; University Hearing Board: Ozgur Ekmekci and Margaret M. Plack; Marvin Center Program Board: Carmen F. Gomez; Marvin Center Governing Board: Jacqueline S. Barnett (other nominees to be announced)**
- e) **Report of the Executive Committee: Lilien F. Robinson, Chair**
- f) **Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees**
- g) **Chair's Remarks**
- 9. **Brief Statements (and Questions)**
- 10. **Adjournment**

*Elizabeth A. Amundson*  
Elizabeth A. Amundson  
Secretary

## **A RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSAL FOR A NEW SCHOOL OF NURSING (09/5)**

**WHEREAS**, a proposal to establish a new School of Nursing was presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on February 26, 2010.

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.A of the *Faculty Code* provides that:

“The Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of schools or other major components of the University.”

**WHEREAS**, Article IX.B of the *Faculty Code* further provides that:

“The faculty cannot perform an effective and responsible role in University decision making without the cooperation of the administrative officers of the University.

“This cooperation includes the provision of such information as is necessary to the development of sound, well-informed recommendations.

“Faculty bodies charged with responsibilities for particular policy and planning areas are entitled, to the extent feasible, to be informed sufficiently in advance of important decisions within their areas of competence to be able to provide their advice or recommendations to the appropriate University officials.”

**WHEREAS**, the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing, as presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, does not include sufficient supporting information to enable the Faculty Senate to evaluate the future prospects of the proposed School or to develop sound, well-informed recommendations concerning the potential advantages, disadvantages, benefits and risks of the proposed School.

**WHEREAS**, the Faculty Senate Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing (“Special Committee”) was appointed by the Executive Committee to review the proposal to establish a new School of Nursing and the Special Committee has submitted a report (a copy of which is attached to this Resolution as Appendix A) that describes the Special Committee's evaluation of the proposal and presents the Special Committee's recommendations for further action; **NOW, THEREFORE**

### **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

1. That, the Faculty Senate has not been provided sufficient information to enable the Senate to fulfill its responsibility under Article IX of the Faculty Code to evaluate the future prospects for the proposed School of Nursing and to develop sound, well-informed recommendations regarding the potential advantages, disadvantages, benefits and risks of the proposed School of Nursing.



2. That, a comprehensive strategic and financial plan for the formation and implementation of the proposed School of Nursing, as described in the report of the Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing attached to this Resolution as Appendix A, should be prepared and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate as soon as is feasible.
3. That, no further action should be taken regarding any approval for the establishment of the proposed School of Nursing at the George Washington University unless a comprehensive strategic and financial plan has been developed and provided to the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate at least 60 days in advance of any potential action by the Board of Trustees dealing with approval of the proposed School of Nursing, so that the Senate will have a reasonable opportunity to consider the comprehensive plan and provide sound, well-informed recommendations to the Administration and the Board of Trustees before any such action is taken.

Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing

Professor Edward Cherian, Chair  
Professor Brian Biles  
Professor Gary Simon  
Professor Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.

Need for a  
Strategic Plan  
for the  
Formation of a School of Nursing  
at the  
George Washington University

On February 26, 2010 Jean Johnson, Senior Associate Dean of Health Sciences Programs, presented School Formation Committee Recommendations for the establishment of a School of Nursing to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. To address this matter, the Executive Committee formed a Special Committee on the Proposed School of Nursing consisting of the following members: Brian Biles, Edward Cherian (Chair), Gary Simon and Arthur Wilmarth.

The Special Committee has reviewed the materials provided to the Executive Committee and understands the need for a swift and decisive response to this proposal based on the projected timeline of events planned.

One important issue requiring initial agreement is the location of the proposed school. Based on the DC Zoning Board's student, faculty and total population limitations, the only feasible location for this new school – in its entirety - will be at the GW Virginia Science and Technology Center in Ashburn, Virginia. (The DC maximum FTE BZA order limits GW to 16,553 students, staff and faculty at Foggy Bottom. Last fall we had 16,473.) Quality space is available at the STC which can be customized to meet the School's needs. The proximity to a good hospital (INOVA Fairfax and INOVA Loudoun Hospital, Lansdowne, VA) further enhances the attraction of this location.

In order for the Special Committee and the Faculty Senate to review the proposed school of nursing, a comprehensive strategic plan for the formation and implementation of the school is required. Enclosed is a list of information, description of concepts and plans and other requirements (although perhaps incomplete) which must be contained in such a plan in order for the Faculty Senate to be able to make a credible analysis and recommendation about the formation of the proposed school.

- 1) Overall Vision: What is the overall long-range goal for the school? Plans for the formation of a Board of Advisors; fund raising for an endowment; national recognition; future accreditation plans for the School. How will the School function as an independent unit reporting to the Provost?
- 2) Market Data: Who are the students to be recruited, the competition, and how the school will compare to the competition. Market research on the need for nurses, both nationally and regionally should be conducted if current data are not available.
- 3) Marketing Plan: Describe the degrees and courses both existing currently and planned. What are the students and faculty recruitment plans? What are the projected enrollments for students and faculty lines? How do we attract "the best"?
- 4) Implementation Plan: a) Who will be the senior executives in the operation of this school? What are their qualifications? Who else is needed? Clear description of the position descriptions for each of the different faculty and staff categories. B) APT criteria and process for each faculty category. How will the School satisfy the 75/25% tenure/tenure track requirement? Overall Plan for Faculty Code compliance. Search committee formation criteria and composition for new faculty searches.
- 5) Organization charts indicating current and future appointments. Proposed by-laws for the School and Programs/Departments consistent with the Faculty Code. Description and plans for acquisition for the physical facilities and equipments required.
- 6) Critical Risks and Strengths: What are the risks that may cause this school to be unsuccessful? What is the strategy and plans for success and growth?
- 7) Financial Plan: A pro forma income/expense statement for five years with the first year in considerable detail. What is the source of required funding? Projections of tuition revenue, research support, donations and cash flow needs. Cost of initial formation (start-up expenses) including proposed use of consultants and special

services. Will the School be self-sustaining from the initial year of operation? If not what will be the sources of subsidies? Planned tuition and other charges, and availability of scholarships/discount rate.

- 8) Detailed plan for the separation of the Nursing Department from the Health Sciences Programs and other Medical Center ties: Equitable division of research contracts, assets, faculty and staff. What will be the remaining relationships with the Health Sciences Programs and School of Medicine after formation of the new School of Nursing?

